REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 24, 2004, a typographical error in the disclosure was noted, which has been corrected. Certain of the claims were objected to because of typographical errors therein, which also have been corrected.

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art (APA) in view of "Network And Distributed Systems Management," edited by Sloman, pages 309-347 (discussed at page 1 of the present specification and made of record by the Applicants.

Claims 4, 5, 9, 10 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over APA and Sloman, further in view of Knapp.

As the APA, the Examiner has designated a number of statements at pages 2 and 3 of the present specification. The Examiner acknowledged that the APA teaches that an event report with an identifier is generated by a managed object and is stored in a database of a Network Management Station, but does not explicitly teach forwarding such an event report to a second database. The Examiner relied on the Sloman reference as teaching such forwarding to a second database.

These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

It is true that the Sloman reference, at page 311, describes sending an event or status report from a first object to a second, different object. This event or status report, however, is merely a *preliminary* event or status report. It is necessary for the second object to add further information to this preliminary event or status report in order to complete the report. The Sloman reference provides an example of a preliminary report as being a report containing the object by which it is generated and an event ID. This information (object and ID) is not sufficient for monitoring a

-8-

managed object, because essential information (such as time information) is still missing. Therefore, Sloman teaches sending the incomplete preliminary report to the further object, in order to add the missing information, which is essential to forming a complete report. Only after the report has been processed at *both objects*, is the report considered to be a completed report. Because the preliminary report lacks essential information, which is provided only by the second object to which it is sent, the preliminary report is not in a useable form unless and until it is processed at the second object.

The Examiner characterized the APA as describing the step of checking, at a first database, if an event report comprises an identifier, with which the event report has been marked if a set of conditions is satisfied. The Examiner cited page 3, lines 10-17 of the present specification as providing such a teaching, however, this portion of the present specification merely describes reviewing reports with a graphical user interface, and then describes the fact that the storage capacity of the database of the Network Management Station (NMS) is limited. There is no description at this location, nor in any other location of the specification wherein Applicants are discussing the prior art, to check the event report for the presence of an identifier that determines whether the event report should be stored. As described in the present specification, the conventional approach of course involves evaluation of an identifier of the type described at page 2 of the present specification, but this evaluation results only in a determination being made as to *how* the report should be stored, rather than *if* it should be stored at all.

Therefore, the APA does not disclose or suggest checking an identifier, with this an event report is marked, to determine whether the event report should be

stored, and the Sloman reference does not teach forwarding a completed report to a second location for storage at the second location.

Each of the independent claims has been amended to make clear that the event report discussed therein is a completed event report, and also has been amended to make clear that the event report is stored only if the identifier is present. For the reasons discussed above, the APA and Sloman, even if taken in combination, do not disclose or suggest such a computerized method nor such a networked system as set forth in the claims of the present application.

For the reasons discussed above, moreover, even if the APA/Sloman combination were further modified in accordance with the teachings of Knapp, the subject matter of claims 4, 5, 9, 10, and 16-20 still would not result, since those claims embody the subject matter of the respective independent claims from which they depend.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

Steven H. Noll (Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicants.